# FELLOWSHIP

January 1944 Vol. X—No. 1

Faith is the bird that feels the light
when the dawn is still dark.

— RABINDRANATH TAGORE

## Chicken in the Bottle

by

JOSEPHINE W. JOHNSON

•

Retribution and the Christian — by Stephen Hobhouse

*Memo:* What About UNRRA? — by John Nevin Sayre

Reflections on COs in Prison — by A. J. Muste

•

## News of FOR and NSBRO

15 cents a copy

$1.50 a Year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

# John Haynes Holmes

My visitor was a strange sort of man. He was a powerful personality, yet gentle in mien and manner. He was obviously in trouble, but seemed not a bit disturbed. His serenity amazed me.

"What's the difficulty?" I asked.

"Well," he replied, "I am an alien, and I suppose all aliens are more or less under suspicion in wartime."

"But you haven't done anything," I insisted.

"I don't know," he answered. "I may have been talking too much. I have been guilty of that sort of thing before." He smiled with charming frankness.

"But what did you say?" I asked.

"Well, I heard Dr. Boanerges the other Sunday. He was very bitter against the Germans and the Japanese, and after the service I asked him how he reconciled what he had said with the teachings of the New Testament about loving our enemies, and forgiving seventy times seven. He seemed indignant—was somewhat abusive. He may have felt it his patriotic duty to report me to the authorities.

"Then I went to the Public Forum not so long ago, and asked some questions. I wanted to know if refusing food to starving women and children in foreign lands was a civilized practice. And I referred to the bombing of civilians, and asked if it was not as vile and terrible a thing to bomb Hamburg and Berlin as to bomb London and Coventry. This aroused considerable opposition.

"I'm quite a hand at making public speeches," he continued. "I'm a kind of soap-boxer. Whenever there's a chance, I like to stand up and say my say to the people. I was in the Park the other night, and gathered quite a crowd around me. I told them I thought we ought to work for peace—that this war could be ended tomorrow if we pitied people half as much as we hated enemies. I insisted that there was a higher interest than any country, and that that interest was humanity. I said something about a Kingdom. I don't think they understood. They took me for some kind of fascist, I guess—or some monarchist who was out to overthrow democracy. I am sure somebody there put the military on my trail."

"But why do you talk—" I began, and then stopped for very shame. What kind of a country was this, or what kind of a Christian was I, that I should counsel anybody to silence when his heart was moved with pity, and his mind seeking a way to peace?

"I don't think you mean that," he said. "In any case, I can't keep silent. I've seen too much. I've got to speak lest the very stones rise up and cry out against me."

He looked very splendid as he said these words. But his face was dark with pain, and his voice touched with an emotion that moved the heart. He seemed for a moment to forget me, and to be looking far away. I felt uneasy, as though time were slipping from my grasp, and I was no longer here but elsewhere. It reminded me of the old suspicion that we have lived upon this earth before, in some other age and place. Suddenly my visitor came to himself.

"How old do you think I am," he asked without warning.

"Well," I answered, confusedly, "it's hard to say. You don't look old, yet—"

"You're right! I'm far older than I look, or than you think. I've lived a long time, and I've always been in trouble. When I was a young man, in my home, I was driven out of town by a lynching mob. Later on, I was arrested, and tried for sedition, and tortured, and—and—"

He seemed to forget me again, and was silent. Something was absorbing him, some old memory of pain.

"That was only the beginning," he went on, at last. "I have wandered far since that early day, but it has always been the same. Wherever I go, and ask people to hear me, there is trouble. You see, there are some things that I believe in tremendously. That men are brothers—*all* men! That men should love one another, and be unfailingly compassionate and kind! That they should not resent injuries, least of all avenge them, but forgive them, and love the offender the more for his need of pity and understanding! I have always despised violence and hate, since these stand in the way of the love that alone can overcome evil. I have begged men not to strike, or maim, or fight, or kill, or even punish, but just to do good to everybody. For there can't be any love in the world unless first there is love in your heart."

"But that seems harmless enough," I broke in.

"Not to the powerful," he cried, with an awful sternness in his voice.

"Not to the powerful," he repeated. "Not to those who run this world. They exist by power, and power prevails through force and violence. The powerful hate those whom they rule, because they fear them. Hate is begotten of fear! So when you talk to these people about love, you talk about the most dangerous thing in the world. They know perfectly well that their power would not last an hour if this love once got started among men. Because I tell men about love, and about the new kingdom that love will bring, the great ones of the earth denounce me as a disturber, and punish me as a criminal. And so I go to prison, or am exiled, or—"

He paused again, and for a long time was silent.

"Well," he said at last, "I'm afraid you can't help me. I understand." And he arose.

"But what are you going to do?" I asked, rising also.

"I don't know," he replied. "It makes little difference. It will be the same story again. I go from place to place, from land to land, and always I am turned away. I fear that's my fate. But I have endured it for a long, long time and I can endure it still!"

He reached to me his hand, and as I extended mine to grasp it, I suddenly shrank back, for there was blood upon his palm.

"You are wounded," I cried. "Look—your hand!"

He seemed not to be surprised as he gazed quietly at his bleeding palm, and watched the blood-drops dripping to the floor.

"I am sorry," he said, with great gentleness. "You must forgive me. This is an old scar. Every now and then, it bleeds again."


FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

R. ALFRED HASSLER
*Managing Editor*



EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Dorothy Detzer
Eugene Exman
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Amos B. Hulen
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Willis J. King
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Donovan E. Smucker
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman



FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

# FELLOWSHIP

*THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION*

**January 1944** **Vol. X—No. 1**


**The Senator's cleaning-woman always made the Senator feel depressed. She was so sure, and so smug in her sureness. There was no chink in the armor of her certainty. She reminded him of the —**

# Chicken in the Bottle

*A Short Story by*

JOSEPHINE W. JOHNSON

THE Senator saw her from his study window. Coming slowly, methodically, in her gray shapeless dress, between the fierce red zinnia flowers. The dress came to the tops of her high laced shoes and looked like a paper bag. She wore no hat, and the morning sun made her glasses wink with light and shine down on her pale plain face. "Oh, God," he thought, "how plain!"

Louise Barford came twice a week and cleaned the house methodically, indifferently. When she leaned over to pick up the wastebaskets, one could see three inches of black cotton stocking on her thin straight legs. When one got closer, the dress became not gray but deliberately hideous, with small unmeaning print of a greenish web. It had a round bib collar and no brooch.

She belonged to some small religious sect, his wife told him. The Reformed Church of the Something, or the Reorganized Assembly of the Something. Probably the Reorganized Church of the Reformed God, Senator Davis thought gloomily, and watched her pass his open door without turning her plain and vacant face to right or left and hang her umbrella on the hat rack in the hall.

Her coming always filled him with a faint depression. As though a sparrow of ill omen had fluttered in the door. It was not that her presence gave him a premonition of man's mortality or filled him with a sense of sin, as she probably hoped, but—seeing her—he felt a sad sensation of life's waste. *Thou hast conquered, O pale Galilean, the world has grown gray with thy breath.* . . .

She could not ever have been a pretty girl, in spite of her one amazing feature, her bright gold hair. Her heavy, pit-marked face was perched on a thready neck, her chin receded and was lost. But the world does not revolve around pretty chins—it was the lost and receding spirit that he mourned. He did not know exactly what this Church had taught her, except to dress like a modest sack, but it had inculcated the principle of inhibition, developed the instinct to retire. She moved in an aura of smug vacuity. In a little narrow gray peanut world of the good and the saved; and all outside was evil.

The Senator leaned back in his chair and pushed aside his papers. The morning sun fell gold on Page One of *Post-War Problems*. The morning sun flooded the whole room, and the glass top of his table burned like a diamond. It was a great and beautiful room, and the window opened out full length on the summer lawn. The smell of fresh-cut grass came in, warm and rich, mixed with late summer roses, and the sound of his children's voices playing in the pool. The width and richness of life, the infinite and inexhaustible *sources* of happiness always struck him poignantly on Tuesdays and Fridays when Louise came in. It was as though the sun became suddenly more brilliant, the blue and gold air more ravishing, his children healthier, more heart-devouring, his wife the most beautiful and desirable of women: all because of this little gray shoe-box body, to whom all this was the pomp and vanity of the world, the snare and delusion of the soul.

He picked up a cigarette to light it, and then put it down. Louise never emptied the ash-trays in a house. "I cannot do it," she had told his wife. A pale and righteous flicker had come into her eyes. Her voice had trembled a little with emotion. "Please do not ask me to do it." She had stood very straight.

"She was sorry I did not strike her," Katherine had told him mournfully. "I cheated her."

Afterwards she had come into the Senator's study. Precisely at five, gripping her black umbrella. She had stood a moment in the door without smiling, and then moved forward and faced him across the desk. He had constructed what he thought was a warm and friendly smile, and had spoken to her brightly: "Good evening, Louise! Tired? Something that I—"

But she did not smile. Her face was white, and then a

dull bluish red. "I want to ask you to forgive me," she said.

"To forgive you? To—"

"To forgive me for the bitter thoughts I have had. About you."

"Thoughts? Bitter thoughts?" The Senator was a great man. He had, on occasion, talked with brilliance and unusual common sense for over three hours. He could not think of anything to say.

Louise had shifted her umbrella. "Bitter thoughts for these"—she pointed at the soiled, the stub-stacked ash-tray— "for this—" The Senator's eyes followed and focused on an empty glass in the bottom of which was coiled a lemon peel. "And for many other things."

The Senator had bowed his head a little and restrained an impulse to cross himself.

In the end she had forgiven *him* and gone.

He wondered often why he let her bother him. Much—most—of life was waste. Why then should he concern himself with hers? But it was not the waste of her life so much as some nagging memory in his mind: and suddenly the image of that memory came clearly to him as he watched her meek smug moving from hall to closet and from room to room. The flesh might rebel at its denial, but the soul glorified, accepting some immortal premise for the body's pain. *Accepting some premise . . . accepting. . . .* He saw again the window and the crowd, the high-necked bottle, and inside the long, thin pullet pecking idly at its corn. "They put it in that bottle there when it was just a chick," a man had said. "It ain't never known the difference. Healthy, too."

He had watched in idle curiosity, measuring the bottle, wondering how much the chicken still could grow. Once it had looked up at the bottle's neck and shivered in the narrow draft. Its round and yellow eyes were cold. "The Humane Society ought to get those people sure!" a woman said. "That ain't a way to live."

"What's the difference? *It* don't know the difference."

The Senator drew little squares across his paper. *"It was good for my fathers And it's good enough for me,"* he chanted. He found himself talking to Louise Barford as though she were an erring colleague: "My distinguished opponent, the young lady from the Gospel Church . . . does it not also say in Luke (Christ speaking): *It has been said to you of old time . . . But* I *say unto you—"*

He looked up and saw Louise across the hall in the living-room. Her back was turned, but he saw her quietly, softly tapping an empty Coca Cola glass against the hearth. There was a little crash and she swept the shattered greenish glass away, her shoulders stiff with triumph. "The beast with the seven horns," the Senator said softly, "and she has conquered him. It does not matter that she knows that we will drink again."

He thought to get up and shut the door so he could not see her. Because she is molded, because she accepts, because she is without pain within the bottle. Why in God's name—even in the name of the Reorganized God—must I let her get under my skin?

He swung his chair about and faced the terrace window. The pungency of marigolds came through the air. He saw the beak of a hummingbird dart down the lemon lilies. The gold and scented air made him feel exultant and at the same time dreamy and uninclined to work. Slowly he moved his hand toward his pen and sat brooding. He had forgotten Louise, his mind near to memories he dared not venture on. Across the desk he faced the picture of his son and regarded it quietly. He had died four months ago somewhere in the South Pacific. The Senator could look at the picture now and feel no pain. In his heart he accepted the sacrifice and kept his eyes on the sacred smoke from the altar. He accepted what seemed the inevitable necessity of this death.

Then he turned and marshalled his thoughts with brisk precision. Just so much time. Just so many words, and to present a matter without verbal waste. Prefaces, but not preambles.

He picked up the title page of *Post-War Problems* and reread what he had written there: *" . . . and so in order to prevent a recurrence of these events . . . basing all future plans on the premise of war's periodic recurrence, basing our plans for patrolling and policing the world on the fundamental principle of maximum armament and conscription, and proceeding from this premise, I advocate—"*

Suddenly the Senator put out his hand and looked down at his fingers. The nails clinked a little on the glass top of the table. He put out his hand and moved it in the air around him. He felt the smooth, the polished air. He moved uneasily in his chair and seemed to feel a small draft down his neck. The Four-Square Gospel, based—based on the fundamental premise. . . . Somewhere the deep voice singing, jeering: *"It was good for our fathers And it's good enough for me!* He rolled his eyes upward and hunched his shoulders and drew down his head.

The little funneled draft was cold.

## MARCHING MEN

*Left, right, left, right;*
*Left, right, left, right;*

*Listen! The sound of marching men!*
*Marching away to war again.*
*Men from the fact'ries, farms and schools,*
*Leaving their benches, books and tools;*

*Husbands, sweethearts, fathers, sons,*
*Boldly marching, bearing their guns,*
*A war was fought that war might cease,*
*The war was won, we lost the peace.*

*Will they return, these marching men?*
*And will men have to march again?*
*Will this be the war to make war cease?*
*Will we win the war, but lose the peace?*

*Left, right, left, right;*
*Left, right, left, right.*
*The steady beat of marching feet,*
*Left, right, left, right;*
*The sound of the marching men!*

CHARLES S. BRADEN.

MUST THE CHRISTIAN STAND BY AND SEE EVIL GO UNPUNISHED? CAN HE ACT AS THE INSTRUMENT OF GOD'S JUSTICE? THE WELL-KNOWN ENGLISH MYSTIC DISCUSSES—

# Retribution and the Christian

By STEPHEN HOBHOUSE*

ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE bases his support of national armaments and of punitive or preventive war largely on the doctrine of "just retribution," as distinct from the self-centered spirit of vengeance. Such retribution is advocated as being a form of personal activity proper to God, who is Love, to Christ, and to the Christian—a form of justice prompted by holy or "righteous" anger at sins of violence and cruelty; it expresses itself by the infliction of suffering and loss in some degree proportionate to the wrong done, and is justified as the true expression of love and loyalty not only to God and to goodness and to the victims of aggression, but equally also to the wrongdoers (who in the present issue are primarily the leaders of the Nazis and other fascist aggressors).

I shall try in what follows to put the case of those Christian thinkers, probably a growing company, who believe that the infliction of retributive suffering of a judicial kind, in some kind of proportion to crime or guilt, is not, however well meant, a fitting task for the Christian, and does not, in his hands, best promote God's ends of love and justice.

For this conviction we find support in various fields of human experience, research, and experiment—educational, medical, penal, international. But it is based fundamentally upon a deep-seated, persistent intuition, glimpsed at least by some of the great Christian mystics and thinkers of the past, that the infliction of punitive suffering, with the "righteous wrath" that is said to underlie it, is not an activity of the God revealed by Jesus, considered *as a Person;* it cannot be harmonized with his love or with true justice, which looks unvaryingly not backward to past sin and guilt, but forward to the ultimate healing and salvation of the sinner, to his restoration to his "just" place in the reunited family of God. "Wrath," *retribution,* "divine punishment" so-called, is an *impersonal, cosmic activity of God considered as Law* and as the principle of cause and effect, both material and moral, as the First Cause of the particular law by which sin produces suffering and loss as well as more sin, when left to itself.

In one aspect, indeed, the "punishment" is simply a creation of the soul that revolts from God into its own self-centeredness. Sin is one result of God-ordained human free will, and God is no more and no less responsible for its "punishment" than he is for the sin itself. Indeed, the two, the crime and its punishment, inevitable in one form or other, cannot be dissociated. What we have here is just "the unravelling of the dreadful consequences of sin" (Dougall) or "the universal necessity by which the whole of our evil action appears sooner or later, whenever a part of it appears" (see Emerson on *Compensation*).

Nevertheless—and this is the special Christian belief—forgiveness, divine and human, bringing with it the wholesome suffering of remorse and penitence, may supervene to modify largely and arrest the process of this *karma.* God is, indeed, in one sense the cosmic author of earthquake and conflagration, of degeneration and disease. He is found in the inexorable laws of consequence, of moral "accumulation," as the fountain of enhanced vitality to the good will and of progressive deterioration and disaster to the evil will. It is as such that he is pictured in the stern Judge or Monarch of some of the parables of Jesus; or, again, as "hardening" the hearts of bad men. But our Lord taught that, as the Father and lover of our souls, God is not the direct or personal author of deterioration, retribution, or destruction, whether in this world or the next. Moreover, Jesus taught, *if Christians,* ignoring or denying this, *become the agents of God's impersonal law of consequence,* they are then acting, not as followers or "imitators" of Christ, who is God personally expressed, but, in scriptural language, as pagan "rods" or "axes" of Jehovah, as "ministers of wrath." By so endeavoring to operate the impersonal law that is not for them to administer, and to inflict upon the evildoer additional punishments of their own devising, *they become themselves involved in the sin and all its fatal complex of consequence.*

## The Instruments of Justice

This last conclusion seems to emerge clearly from an unbiased examination of both the New Testament and the chief prophetic books of the Old Testament. Thus, according to the book of Isaiah (Ch. XLV), it is not the soldiers of God's chosen people but those of the heathen conqueror, the Persian Cyrus, who are raised up by the Lord (who "creates" darkness and evil as well as light and peace) to subdue the tyrant of Babylon and break its gates of brass in pieces. And, as Professor C. H. Dodd writes in his (Moffatt, N.T.) *Commentary on Romans* (XIII: 1-7, p. 204), the "retributive system of justice in a non-Christian society" is a "manifestation of the natural laws of cause and effect, lying outside the order of grace revealed in Christ"; therefore "the Christian takes no part in the administration of a retributive system: but in so far as it serves moral ends, he must submit to it." (Note that a "system of justice" need not be retributive.)

It is only a love proceeding from the actual or potential

*This essay, first published in the *Hibbert Journal,* was revised and reprinted as a pamphlet by the FOR in Great Britain. The author, who was a CO in World War I, is widely known for his writings on British prisons and on Christian mysticism.

victim of the aggressor who voluntarily accepts and endures his injuries with a patience that refuses to be provoked, that can, sooner or later, redeem the aggressor and produce true peace. And all the time, concurrently with these upbuilding forces of forgiving love, the worst elements of an evil society are dissolved by the processes of decay and self-destructive conflict. So, as has often been remarked, the revolution of violence, after having devoured the bad old regime, then proceeds to "devour its own children," leaving the way open for a milder and more constructive government.

It is most remarkable and significant that the normal Greek word for justice, *dikaiosune,* cognate with the important Pauline term "justification," is scarcely, if ever, used in the New Testament with any reference to retributive punishment. Our Authorized Version always translates it "righteousness," and indeed the English word "justice" never occurs in the (A.V.) New Testament. (In the Roman Catholic or *Douay* version "justice" is the usual translation). The great Sermon of Jesus may quite fittingly be described as a code of divine "justice" (i.e. *dikaiosune,* see Matt. V: 6, 10, 20; VI: 1, 33) ; and it is surely again deeply significant that in it the ancient law of retributive justice based on anger and hatred toward evil and hostile men (V: 38, 21-22, 43) is finally repudiated and we are given instead the new law of "love" and forgiveness and intercession for them and are bidden to hunger and thirst after the "justice," the "perfection" of God, who is always "kind toward the unthankful and evil." Thus here, and generally in the New Testament, justice (*dikaiosune*), though it usually includes the idea of deliverance from the oppression of others' sin as well as of one's own, *is primarily the active, creative goodness of God, who ever strives, through the sacrifice of the Cross, to impart to all his creatures their allotted share of his own perfections.*

Here then, in brief outline, is what we hold to be the Christian doctrine of retribution. Certainly it is true that this conception of God, more perhaps than any other, involves the tremendous problem of how he can be conceived as acting at once both as loving, forgiving Personality and also as inexorable Law or its First Cause. This is presumably one of those inescapable antinomies or paradoxes that no metaphysics can thoroughly explain and which is, like the kindred one of determinism and free will, beyond the reach of the human mind. To me the most helpful approach to an approximate explanation is through Jacob Boehme's vision of the irrational or dark "center" in God, adopted with some modifications by William Law, which Nicolas Berdyaev accepts as one of the foundations of his metaphysics.[1]

Besides the three writers just mentioned Lily Dougall (collaborator with Professor B. H. Streeter in a series of remarkable books[2]) has been the pioneer in the last generation of this view of retribution and wrath, a view that we believe to be implicit in the Gospels and Epistles, allowing for certain intrusions of the punitive Old Testament conception, due to the limitations of the New Testament writers. Similar teaching is to be found in some medieval and early Catholic mystics and theologians, particularly during the first three centuries. (e.g. Irenaeus and Origen), though there it is closely associated with the different Greek ideal of *ataraxia* or state of passionless serenity.

There are certain further essential articles of faith which require to be worked into our view of the universe of being, in order to make the above statements more reasonable.

## The Failure of Force

Firstly, it is, we believe, *impossible to remove evil or abolish the influence of evil persons* upon other persons and things *by any attempted isolation or deterrent repression* of those persons (however necessary such may appear as the temporary expedient of our weakness). This is because evil resides primarily in desires and thoughts, which are capable of making contacts and penetrations through all material barriers and into every corner of the universe. Hence all attempts to prevent evil men from doing harm by condemning them to solitary confinement, to death (in war or by execution), to a hypothetical everlasting hell, or to any other form of supposed deterrent isolation, are based on an illusion and are in the long run worse than useless. Eventual self-annihilation of certain incurably weak or self-perverted personalities is conceivable, but appears to us to be ruled out as being an impossible defeat of God's love expressed in their creation. It follows that the only way to abolish evil is by the "conversion" of the personality expressing it, a conversion to be won by the gradual impact upon the sinner of utterly patient love expressed in the vicarious suffering, the cross-bearing, of his victims, that is, of Christ himself and of Christlike men and women. In this connection we need to think out afresh the nature of the omnipotence which we attribute to God.

Along with this goes the tremendous fact of *the "solidarity" of all individuals and nations*—solidarity in sin and in suffering as well as in goodness and joy. Most of us have indeed an immense difficulty in overcoming the normal feeling of individual separateness and isolation. But the experience of the mystics, Western and Eastern, and the researches of psychology indicate that there is a universal overlapping of personalities, a gradually increasing intercommunion and interpenetration of all individual spirits. No victim of wrong (save Christ, the incarnate God, alone) is entirely innocent, though children and others undeveloped both in good and in evil, appear to be so.

*Every one of us shares in some measure in the guilt* of the most evil men and of the most perverted nation. As Gandhi has said: "I cannot detach myself from the wickedest soul." The essence of all sin, so the mystics continually remind us, is preoccupation with self and its imagined separateness—from God first and also from each other. "Nothing burneth in hell but self-will," expressed as pride, wrath, and greed.

As regards nations indeed and other groups a careful reading of history often shows clearly just where and how the sins of one community have caused or encouraged the sins of another. In the present case of the British Empire, of Germany, and of Japan, this interconnection seems to many of us particularly clear. But always there are countless invisible threads of influence for good and for ill, which no human eye or mind can detect. Moreover, potentially and, therefore, fundamentally, all individual spirits are united in their parent God and in that redeemed humanity which is the "body of Christ"; and all are, we believe,

[1] See, *e.g.,* Berdaev's *Meaning of History* (1936), pp. 53-59; and William Law, *Selected Mystical Writings* (S. Hobhouse), Study 24, "The Wrath of God."

[2] See, *e.g.,* L. Dougall's contributions to their joint books, *Concerning Prayer* (1916, pp. 166 ff.) and *Immortality* (1917, pp 307 ff.); also Norman Robinson, *Christian Justice,* 1922.

in the process of returning, often through long periods of self-imposed separation and torment, into restored communion with Heaven and its Lord.

There is great need today for a spiritual and intellectual genius able to mould into a harmonious and persuasive body of thought the various considerations which I have here outlined. The present very imperfect sketch is submitted as an incentive to better equipped minds to work upon this vital theme. For I am daring enough to maintain that the abolition of war and of armed conflicts, and the redemption and survival of our civilized society, depend as much as on any other single human achievement, on the acceptance in theory and in practice by the leaders of the churches and of other spiritual societies of some such view of retribution and forgiveness as that set out above.

Our view that retribution, however "just," is not conducive to human welfare, appears to find wide confirmation in the fields of educational practice and psychotherapy, and particularly in that of penal method. As to this last, I may perhaps claim to speak with some measure of authority, having myself (as a Quaker "war-resister") shared with many criminal offenders over twelve months of severe "hard labor" sentences and afterwards helped to conduct a lengthy public inquiry into the penal system. The results of this inquiry played a considerable part in causing the prison authorities to abandon the regime, in force in British prisons up to about 1924, which definitely made "retributive" punishment the chief aim.[1] It was shown fairly conclusively that this aim of retribution, however moral and "majestic," could not be carried out without doing incalculable harm in most cases both to the prisoner and to the society of which he still remains a part, and often to those who administer his punishment.

### Retribution vs. Restraint

At first sight it may appear that the question of just retribution cannot be dissociated from that of the restraining force or violence of "just" war (if such there be) or of justifiable police action. Consideration of the violence that may have to be used against a morally innocent but dangerous lunatic shows that this is not so. So does an examination of the various forms of prison treatment. It seems proved that *the infliction of retributive suffering by a fellow creature almost invariably stirs up the resentment and pride of a man habituated to evil ways and thus degrades and brutalizes him still further.* On the other hand the restraining (not purposely retributive) force of arrest and trial, and of a benevolently controlled freedom of action should suffice for the actual maintenance of law and order (never, indeed, completely consistent with justice), and the humiliation involved in these experiences represents, it has been found, for the truly guilty, the extent to which punitive suffering may be beneficent and educational. But even the punishment of mild restraint or "probation" normally does no permanent good unless it be combined with active good will in the persons operating it.

In our present case, it is almost out of the question that a *nation,* having experienced, after a life-and-death struggle, the agonies of military defeat, would be ready to accept as wholesome discipline the infliction of further sufferings and humiliations at the hands, not of an impartial tribunal, but of its victorious enemies. Most important, too, is the consideration that extensive retributive action of this kind would inevitably distract our minds and our energies from the tremendous constructive tasks of relief, reform, and revolution that will confront us all in the post-war world of tomorrow. And "just retribution" is very unlikely to come from a very mixed body of politicians and soldiers, at different levels of moral achievement and religious faith, and representing overstrained nations exulting in victory and fresh from the poisonous infections of war. Such "retributive" punishment administered on a national scale and so precariously sponsored, may well prove to be, in effect, only vengeance under another name.

[1] See the *Prison Commissioners' Reports,* e.g,. for the years 1911 and 1912; and *English Prisons Today* (S. Hobhouse and A. F. Brockway, 1922).

---

# *The Wounded*

*Written after seeing a page of pictures showing wounded soldiers being taught more of the arts of war during convalescence. The pictures appeared in the St. Louis* Post-Dispatch *on August* 29, 1943.

When they come home, the wounded,
Let them rest a while from thoughts of death and dying
Before they are sent back to fight.
Take down the miniature bomber from above each bed,
There to be looked at and studied,
And in its place hang a picture
Of a man building a house.
Be sure the man is building—
Not tearing down.
When the wounded are stronger
And their hands can hold a book,
Give them a tale of service sprung from love—
Not a book of war
Where strategists devise new cunning ways to kill.
If their nervous fingers itch for work
Let them weave a net—
Not for camouflage
But for a baby's crib,
Where life begins.
When they are strong enough to leave their beds
And assemble in a classroom,
Do not explain the workings of a Tommy Gun
That reeks of death,
But show on a screen
How nature heals the deep gash
In the tree's torn side.
Only a little time ago the wounded
Were laughing young men, fresh from the schoolroom,
Who quaffed the goblet of life
And found it filled with sunshine.
They are still young men,
Young men with old men's faces
And the light gone from their eyes.
Let them rest a while from thoughts of death and dying
Before they are sent back to fight.

Margretta Scott Lawler.

**Forty-four nations have joined forces in the huge task of feeding the hungry and clothing the naked after the war. How much does their action promise for future world cooperation?**

# *Memo:* What About UNRRA?

By JOHN NEVIN SAYRE*

WE of the Fellowship feel an intense interest in the recently formed United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, with its objectives of aid and relief for the victims of war, return of prisoners and exiles to their homes, and assistance to countries stricken by war in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial services.

It is a source of deep satisfaction to see this indication that governments are preparing to collaborate in an agency designed to set in motion and accelerate the basic processes of peace. But just because it is so essential to win the peace, it is of critical importance that this first of the inter-governmental post-war agencies of reconstruction be a truly reliable and effective instrument. Therefore we are moved to examine the constitution and program being projected by UNRRA and to set down for the consideration of members of the Fellowship, and others, both the constructive possibilities of UNRRA and certain dangers which, if not faced and overcome, might all too easily wreck the hopes that men of good will are eager to place upon it. The time for such an appraisal is now while its plans and program are still in the initial and formative stage, and before questionable steps of far-reaching importance are taken which later might prove to be of serious harm.

## I

On the side of constructive possibilities for immense good, we note that UNRRA proposes to carry forward into the period of war's distintegrating aftermath, international collaboration of an impressive number of nations for the elemental task of immediate humanitarian relief. Such action can save the lives and restore the hopes of countless millions of human beings. The principle that each member government contribute an equal percentage of its annual income or proportionate share of its resources is sound. A vast pool of material wealth can thus be made available for distribution at the points of greatest need.

UNRRA is democratic to the extent that in its Council, which has supreme authority in the organization, each member nation has just one vote, and the Council votes by simple majority. There is no crippling unanimity rule. The Council is to meet in regular session not less than twice a year and it may be convened in special session within thirty days after request therefor by one-third of the members of the Council. Although a Central Committee composed of the Big Four nations has power to "make policy decisions of an emergency nature" between sessions of the Council, all such decisions are "open to reconsideration by the Council" at any subsequent session. Whether in practice this will prove a sufficient check upon misuse of power by the overwhelming military and economic might of the Big Four nations which compose the Central Committee remains to be seen.

Executive authority is centered in one man, the Director General, who is responsible to the Central Committee and the Council, but with the important proviso that "while hostilities or other military necessities exist in any area" he shall not undertake activities therein "without the consent of the military command of that area." This stipulation is full of danger to democratic procedure, for it allows the nations which control the military commanders in a given area to set the stage against impartial and non-political distribution of supplies before UNRRA ever comes in. Commitments might be entered into which later UNRRA would be unable to undo. However, within UNRRA itself executive power is lodged in a single responsible officer who can be held accountable for the management of the organization.

There is no provision for use of military force. This is in line with the procedure adopted by the International Labor Office, which over a period of troublous years has proved itself effective without depending upon military or economic coercion.

## II

Yet over against the good purposes and provisions in the organizational set-up of UNRRA, we note some serious defects in its structure and announced policies, especially as they relate to the governments that have brought UNRRA into being. Among them we list the following:

(a) UNRRA is born and christened as the child of only those nations that are allied or associated with one side in the war. Membership *may* never be open on equal terms to all nations. UNRRA's first Conference adopted provisions which in effect would discriminate against "ex-enemy" nations in the conditions under which they can get relief. Should UNRRA fail to invite all nations to share in its membership and benefits equally, as soon as governments are established which are recognized, we must expect that the people under governments shut out will consider UNRRA to be nothing more than the tool of a victorious military alliance. Then, like the League of Nations, its scope and authority will be so circumscribed that it may not overcome the handicap of misshapen birth.

(b) Similarly, the limitations placed about UNRRA by military authority are highly dangerous. It cannot begin

*This statement, originally prepared by Mr. Sayre, was discussed and somewhat amended by the FOR Executive Committee, which then released it in its present form as an official statement of the Fellowship.

or continue work in any area where "military necessities exist" unless the military commander there consents. He is also the judge of what constitutes a "military necessity." We have only to remind ourselves of General DeWitt and the evacuation of Americans of Japanese ancestry to perceive the danger here.

(c) Probably the greatest hazard which UNRRA faces is the temptation that will come to deflect the stream of its relief away from the impartial ministering to humanitarian need, to turning the wheels of power politics and national diplomacy. Even with promises by spokesmen of UNRRA that this will not be done, it will be a miracle if, to a certain extent, this does not happen. Only a very determined, able and disinterested Director General supported by alert and powerful public opinion can hold UNRRA to a true course through the pressures of special interest that will assail it from every side. If Mr. Lehman can rise to the stature of a Nanssen he may succeed. But if UNRRA uses food as a *weapon,* and once becomes a football of international politics, resentment and hatred will be heaped upon it until it is buried. It is ominous that leading representatives of UNRRA repeatedly speak about it as an agency for winning the war. Though we all want the war to be shortened, it is dangerous to play up UNRRA as an incentive to violent revolution and to associate it with the war business. And even if it were true that this might make easier the securing of initial appropriations for UNRRA from Congress, the long run effect of such statements puts in grave jeopardy the opportunity to win faith in UNRRA and cooperation with it on the part of those hundreds of millions of persons who will belong to the defeated nations. Congressional appropriations bought at that price would tend to defeat the supreme objective of world conciliation and world wide economic rehabilitation.

It is ominous, again, that Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State and the United States representative on the Council and Central Committee of UNRRA, is reported in the press to have told the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives that UNRRA, having no political responsibility whatsoever, will give aid to governments recognized through a formula which he implied was drawn up at the Moscow, Cairo and Teheran conferences. Coupled with his further statement that the military authorities would not turn over relief operations to UNRRA where there is political chaos in a nation, it must be obvious that amid the wire-pulling and maneuvering of political exigencies, UNRRA may not be free to undertake a service of disinterested relief, such as that carried out by British and American Quakers in France, Germany, Austria and Russia at the conclusion of World War I. If it is said that governments cannot reach so high a level, there remains the question of the responsibility of the Christian churches and organizations like the American Friends Service Committee and Fellowship of Reconciliation. If they cooperate with UNRRA, and help build public opinion for it, they must have assurance that they are not hiding under a bushel the light of the world which it is their duty as followers of Christ to let shine.

III

While the future of UNRRA is still in the making, the direction in which UNRRA will go is being fixed to an alarming extent by day-to-day decisions which are being taken now. Specific instances of courses leading in the direction of danger are: (1) Promise of aid to peoples released from rule of the Axis but withholding of aid until that time, especially the inability of UNRRA, to date, to send a single morsel of food to the dying children of Belgium, Holland, Norway, France, etc.; (2) Similar inhibitions imposed upon UNRRA in the case of India by the government responsible for India, which have resulted in failure to extend urgent famine relief; (3) The Atlantic City declaration (which, however, Great Britain, China and the United States sought to modify) that enemy or ex-enemy countries must pay all the expenses connected with any UNRRA operations in their territories. Furthermore, the ruling that they must contribute to the relief of liberated, and possibly other, areas from supplies of food and goods which they have looted from occupied Europe and Asia, while it may have an appearance of fairness, suggests very strongly a policy of reparations based on the sole-guilt theory of war. Have we learned nothing from the past about how *not* to win peace for the future?

This memorandum is necessarily tentative and makes no attempt to be exhaustive or final. It has however seemed right to raise the above questions without delay and to ask if there are good answers to them, and what these answers are. If, as we pray, the future services of UNRRA will really be extended to a suffering world without discrimination on the basis of race, creed, political ideology or affiliation; if relief and rehabilitation are to be administered by UNRRA with an eye single to the greatest human needs wherever those needs are found, it is obvious that eternal vigilance and an adequately informed public opinion are indispensable for UNRRA's herculean task. Only in this way can it expect to make a sufficiently wide and deep appeal to the heart of humanity to escape the toils of power politics, militarism, imperialism, selfish private interests and war hatred, and *put its job across.* If this can happen UNRRA might turn the retreating tide of the world's faith into a rising flow of hope and creative achievement.

---

# *"Feed the Hungry!"*

"We urge the President to open a way through the United Nations' blockade by which food may be sent immediately to the children of occupied countries, to be controlled and distributed by the International Red Cross in some such way as is operating successfully in Greece. We urge Congress to pass immediately the Taft-Gillette Bill (S. R. 100) which is designed to support the President in the above action; and we urge passage of a similar bill in the House of Representatives. We cannot express too strongly our conviction that the winning of peace and the compulsion of religious duty alike demand the exercise of the President's great power to start this action, and we urge that it be started before Christmas."

Resolution of the National Council, Dec. 6, 1943.

Note—On December 20 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously approved the Taft-Gillette Resolution, thus bringing it to the floor of the Senate.

# Reflections

## *on the Problems of*

# COs in Prison

By A. J. MUSTE*

Three attitudes are found among COs who, either because they were "absolutists" or because they were refused IV-E classification and would not submit to induction into the armed forces, have been sentenced to Federal prisons.

I

So far, the great majority have submitted to prison regulations and have been "cooperative" in their attitude toward prison officials. There have been instances where they were called upon to do work which seemed to them to contribute directly to the war effort. They have protested quietly in such ways as were available in prison, and so far as we know always have been put quite promptly on other work. COs in this group also have worked for correction of other conditions in prison, with satisfaction to themselves and often to the prison officials. They have found opportunities to help fellow prisoners in various ways and to exemplify their conception of the spirit and the methods of brotherhood and reconciliation. Authorities have spoken enthusiastically of the influence exerted by such men over other prisoners, and similar testimony has come from non-CO prisoners themselves.

II

A small but apparently growing number of COs feel that they must take an "absolutist" position against the whole Federal prison regime. They are in prison because of their conscience-impelled opposition to war and conscription; how, they ask, can they be expected to change to an attitude of cooperation with these when the conscription regime perpetrates the further evil of throwing them into prison? The only consistent course for them, they feel, is to refuse cooperation and take the consequences.

There is the feeling also that the Federal prison regime—any modern prison regime—is in itself a major evil, corrupt and corrupting, an embodiment of the authoritarian attitude as truly as war itself or conscription. In some of the non-cooperating COs, this feeling exists alongside the former; in others it is perhaps the dominant one.

*This statement was discussed and adopted as an official statement of the views of the FOR Executive Committee at a recent meeting of that body.

III

A few COs whose general attitude has been a cooperative, "non-absolutist" one, have been led to engage in work or hunger strikes over specific issues. The refusal of the authorities in the Danbury and Lewisburg prisons to permit Negroes and whites to sit at an interracial table in the dining-room has been such an issue, as have the censorship of prison mail and the refusal to allow prisoners books and writing materials.

### Points for Consideration

The following points deserve the careful consideration of all pacifists, and in particular those COs in prison who feel called upon to follow a course of protest and non-cooperation.

It can be argued that the whole modern system of statism and regimentation is a *growing* evil, not a regime that is being reformed and improved or that is on the way out. Many feel, therefore, that total opposition must be set against it.

However, it must be remembered that the prison system antedates modern totalitarianism. It is not accurate to call it simply and completely a part of conscription. All who are competent to judge seem to agree that the last century has seen progress in prison reform, with notable improvements in the Federal prison system within the past decade.

Great as are the abuses that still prevail, it thus may well be valid for a pacifist to say: "My fight is against war and conscription. I will carry that fight on so far as I am left in freedom, no matter what the consequences. Once the State shows its hand and reveals that it has no place for the free man except prison, I have made my point. I will submit to the ordinary prison regime, trying to improve it in such ways as are open to me, using my opportunities to interpret pacifism to my fellow inmates, and working to regain my freedom and that of other pacifists in order to resume our work against war and conscription."

The fact that a considerable number of the most deeply spiritual and courageous COs have taken this attitude certainly should give pause to those who incline to an opposite course. Gandhi's life is devoted to Satyagraha, a witness for the way of truth and non-violence, and to the achievement of independence for India by non-violent means. As a result of his work and life, he has been imprisoned often. During imprisonment he has engaged in fasts—though not "unto death"—but for the most part, he seems to have been a submissive prisoner. This in spite of the fact that it could be argued that British jails in India are an integral part of British domination—i.e., of the system against which Gandhi is contending—and the well-known fact that there are grave abuses in the prison system in India.

By and large, virtually all prophets and revolutionists in history, secular and religious, have pursued the same policy in prison as has Gandhi. They are concerned first of all about some social objective—in Gandhi's case, independence for India and abolition of untouchability. What they want is to work in freedom for that objective. When they are deprived of that freedom, they want to get out, and their comrades want them to get out, to continue that work. There is a danger that in submitting to ordinary prison regulations they are compromising with evil, and certainly they must not become insensitive to that danger; but adopting an over-all policy of non-submission also has its dangers.

The pacifist movement today has a tremendous job on its hand, including getting COs out of jail, stopping the war, etc. We ought to consider pretty carefully how that may be done most effectively, and recognize that such consideration involves no moral dereliction. It is legitimate that those who propose to undertake an unconventional course should consider carefully whether they may be diverting a movement from its main course, and, in effect, coercing it into devoting undue attention to a "concern" of a small minority.

### Can't Tackle All Wrongs

No human being can take upon himself the righting of all the wrongs in the world. To some extent we must, and we all do, choose the objectives we emphasize. If it is argued that because we carry on a radical struggle against war and conscription, we also must carry on an equally radical one against the prison system, the same claim may be made legitimately in reference to the economic order, or any one of at least a dozen other evils. It is true that they are all interrelated, yet it seems equally true that we each must set some limit to our objectives. A completely unreal situation would result from adopting what amounts to the position that the existing prison system, the economic order, etc., must all be abolished before we can "submit" or "cooperate" in any respect. A "fast unto death" over the famine in India, Indian independence, the extermination of the Jews, Jim Crow in general, or the continuance of the war itself, might be at least as valid as one over the issue of censorship or any other connected with the comparatively decent American prison system.

Complete "non-cooperation" would seem to mean eventually "the fast unto death," for one who is willing to eat off the system he is fighting is not divorcing himself from it completely, and certainly serious ethical questions can be raised about what would seem to come close to "parasitism." But from the ethical and religious point of view, the fast unto death is obviously a very serious step. Experience seems to show that one or more of the following conditions should be met before this step is taken:

(*Concluded on Page* 14)

# FOR Council Votes to Continue in NSBRO

## December 6 Meeting Sees "No Clear Mandate" for Withdrawal from CPS

After more than five hours of discussion, the FOR National Council on December 6 voted to continue "for the present" its participation in the National Service Board for Religious Objectors and its support of Civilian Public Service Camps and projects. The action, explained in a 3,000-word resolution, was taken unanimously in spite of the predominating personal preference of Council and staff members present that the Fellowship should withdraw from the NSBRO-CPS connection with Selective Service. The "personal preference" vote, recorded for the information of the membership after the principal resolution had been adopted, showed that 17 of those present favored withdrawal, while only 7 felt that the relationship should be continued. Three Council members voted "present."

The decision not to withdraw at this time was based on the feeling that in their replies to the Council's inquiry on the subject the membership of the FOR had given "no clear mandate" for withdrawal, and that such action would not represent a "sense of the meeting" decision even within the Council itself. Letters received from members in reply to the leaflet *Shall the FOR Withdraw from NSBRO?* were in the following ratio:

*Individuals*: for remaining, 179; for withdrawal, 117.

*Group expressions* (where count was included): for remaining, 114; for withdrawal, 292.

*CPS expression*: for remaining, 24; for withdrawal, 63.

(Note—The figures for "withdrawal" include a considerable number that were "conditional" upon failure of Selective Service to improve certain conditions).

### Continuance Conditional

Although the Council declared its action to be "a commitment . . . which a responsible group of people will not abrogate lightly or at short notice," it also pointed out that "virtually none of our members are fully satisfied" with the present situation and that in consequence no one should expect its action to "put a period to discussion or to rule out for any specific period the possibility of amendment or alteration." The resolution called upon both the FOR membership and the Peace Church Service Committees to "continue to work vigorously" for needed changes.

The Council recognized four general points of view among the membership in regard to CPS:

*a.* The conviction that the FOR should withdraw on the basis of fundamental issues of conscience and principle, since the present NSBRO-CPS set-up is assisting in the "administration of conscription";

*b.* The feeling that the expected development of CPS along the lines of the volunteer work-camp pattern has not materialized and will not in the future, and that the pacifist witness would be strengthened by withdrawal;

*c.* The opinion that neither pacifism nor conscience is compromised by the present arrangement to the point where withdrawal is imperative, and that CPS is preserving important values that would be lost were the entire alternative service arrangement to revert to the government;

*d.* The feeling that the FOR, the American Friends Service Committee and the other administering agencies ought to withdraw but only by joint action; that unilateral action on the part of the Fellowship would be "sectarian and divisive."

The Council expressed conviction that complete freedom of discussion must continue within the Fellowship, and that where deep-going differences of conviction exist the organization's instrumentalities must not be used to "implement one tendency as against another," but to help both to achieve their aims in a creative integration.

### Nine-Point Program

The resolution adopted carried nine points, as follows:

(1) The decision to continue in NSBRO, with an expression of appreciation for the "vigor, skill, and religious devotion" with which the Historic Peace Churches have carried on work through the NSBRO, and for the fellowship enjoyed with their representatives even in the face of occasional fundamentally divergent viewpoints;

(2) Approval of the organization of the Big Flats camp as an orientation center under the direction of the Friends, and concern that the Service Committees have returned to them from Selective Service, real control in matters of (*a*) discipline, including penalties; (*b*) transfers, including those to government camps; (*c*) selection and approval of work projects, and (*d*) reclassification. The feeling of some of the Council members was noted that, failing to get such control, the Service Committees "would render a greater service and a clearer witness to pacifism" by withdrawing;

(3) Concern that the educational program in CPS be continued and strengthened;

(4) Continued opposition to military conscription in any form, and refusal to approve any arrangements for COs that do not provide for complete exemption for those who cannot submit to any service under conscription;

(5) Reaffirmation of unalterable opposition to peace-time conscription and refusal to discuss with government officials during war-time any legislation concerning alternative service under a conscription regime;

(6) The reservation that participation in NSBRO and CPS does not commit the Fellowship to approval of a similar set-up in the event of peace-time conscription, or in the event of any future war;

(7) Increased support of the American Civil Liberties Union committee on conscientious objectors (NCCO) in its work on pay and dependency provisions for COs, testing the constitutionality of the military control and other aspects of Selective Service, defense of the civil rights of COs in camp and prison, and extension of parole to the men in prison. The Council voted to the NCCO an appropriation of $50 per month (the same amount as is paid to the NSBRO) from the Fellowship CO Fund;

(8) The continuance of the CO Fund, to be disbursed under the direction of the Executive Committee for the support of otherwise unaffiliated FOR members in CPS, relief of dependents of COs in prison or camp, educational work in CPS, support of such organizations as NSBRO and NCCO, travel expenses of the FOR staff in connection with these matters, and other purposes within the general scope of these objects. Members who prefer should have the opportunity to designate for which of these objects they do, or do not, wish their gifts to be used;

(9) Provision for immediate study of "Ralph Templin's concern that the pacifist movement work out plans for organizing voluntary pacifist service . . . . which would be the basis for a claim to total exemption from all conscript service";

(10) Establishment of a Committee on Prisons to consider and act in the field of relations with "offenders against society" in line with the FOR Statement of Purpose. The Council expressed its gratification that the hunger strike in Lewisburg had ended, and sent greetings and best wishes to the strikers.

*(Continued on Page 14)*

# Lewisburg COs End Fast; Work Strike on at Tucson

Six conscientious objectors in the Northeastern Federal Penitentiary (Lewisburg, Pa.) ended their sixty-four day hunger strike on December 1 after an exchange of letters between Warden William E. Hiatt and Federal Prison Director James E. Bennett promised considerable relaxation of prison restrictions on reading and correspondence privileges.

Director Bennett's memorandum reiterated the need for inspection of prisoners' correspondence, which the strikers had admitted, but added that "this general principle is not intended to imply the exercise of censorship or control over political, social or religious opinion or belief." The same policies "also apply to reading material, books, and magazines," the memorandum added.

In answer to specific questions submitted by the hunger strikers, Mr. Bennett agreed in a supplementary note that the same policies would apply in general to writing done by prisoners in the form of books, poems, diaries, etc.

In ending the strike the men declared: "Although these statements do not embody all the objectives of our original concern, we do feel that they represent a substantial clarification and improvement. . . We are therefore concluding our fast in the faith that the censorship practices will be progressively improved."

Fasters were Paton Price, Dave Dellinger, Bill Kuenning, Jack Dixon, Tom Woodman, and Bill Lovett. Five of them began the hunger strike on September 29, while Lovett joined them on October 10. They had undergone the painful process of tube-feeding since October 22.

### Work Strike at Tucson

Meanwhile, word has come in of a work strike begun on December 13 in the Tucson, Arizona, prison camp by three conscientious objectors, John Hampton, of Hollywood, Calif.; John Abbott, of New York; and Jack Hewelcke, of San Francisco. Both Hampton and Hewelcke are members of the FOR; Abbott is a member of the War Resisters League.

The men are not striking for specific reforms in the prison administration, but because they have concluded that only thus can they succeed in dissociating themselves from conscription and the war effort, and make a "total" protest against those evils.

They point out that the prison itself is cooperating in every way possible with the war effort and that consequently the inmates inevitably are caught in the war pattern unless they refuse to do any work at all. As instances of prison participation in war the men cite the salvaging of materials for the war, the training of men for work in war industries, and similar activities.

The men have no grudge against the prison administration, which they report as having been tolerant and understanding.

---

## Attacks on Pacifist Groups Multiplying

Attacks on the Fellowship of Reconciliation and other pacifist groups, surprisingly few thus far in the war, seem to be multiplying lately in the press and on the radio.

The Hearst papers, especially in the Far West, had a field day in connection with the "riots" at the Tule Lake center for "disloyal" Japanese and Japanese-Americans. Although no charges have ever been levelled against any of the few Fellowship members on the center's staff, rewrite and headline men in the Hearst organization implied that the presence of the FOR group was of major importance, and through wholly inaccurate interpretations of statements torn from their context gave the impression that the Fellowship was some sort of "cult" fostering disloyalty to the United States.

Other attacks have appeared in New York's "liberal" daily, *PM*. Under the streamer headline: "'Soft Peace' Forces Uniting to Prevent Allied Victory," *PM* devoted a full page on December 6 to an attack on a Philadelphia meeting sponsored by the National Council for the Prevention of War and participated in by the FOR and other pacifist groups. Using the Hearst technique of half-truths and misinterpretation, the story implied that pacifists are trying to organize another "America First" movement, and would like to see "peace on any terms, even Hitler's."

Public reaction to the attacks must have been a little disappointing to the attackers. *PM* printed one letter from a reader, who slapped the newspaper for its "naive" belief that wars can be ended by marching into Berlin and Tokyo. And one letter from an unknown soldier came to the FOR National office, addressed to A. J. Muste. It read:

"Here's to you, boy! Come on, get this thing over and us guys back home!

(Signed) A civilian-soldier in Roosevelt's army."

## Press Blamed for Tule Lake Inaccuracies

Recent authoritative information received concerning the rioting at the Tule Lake internment center for "disloyal" Japanese and Japanese-Americans presents an entirely different picture from that appearing in lurid newspaper stories. Several important points are brought out:

1. The disturbance, engineered by a small but determined group of Japanese, was "nowhere near as violent" as most newspapers indicated. Most of the evacuees present had been led to believe that a peaceful gathering was to be held; they would have "stayed in their barracks" had they known what was going to happen.

2. Most of the FOR members, both Japanese and Caucasian, had left the camp when it was changed to a center for the "disloyal," so that very few were there at the time of the rioting.

3. Two men who received particularly rough treatment were described as having invited such action by their attitude toward the internees.

4. The legislative investigation at the village of Tule Lake was described as a "farce." Only a one-sided picture was developed, with all witnesses called from among those basically antagonistic to the evacuees. "Not one witness was called who entertained any doubt about 'a Jap being a Jap.'"

It was pointed out also that the general newspaper assumption that all evacuees are actively disloyal to the United States is inaccurate. There are four classes of persons in Tule Lake camp at the present time: (1) individuals who have expressed a desire to return to Japan after the war; (2) some that the FBI is holding because of indications of disloyalty; (3) a group of persons whose answers to questionnaires were ambiguous, often because of confusion and misunderstanding; and (4) wives and children of some of the other groups. Many of the first group, it is said, had always considered themselves loyal Americans, but had become cynical and disillusioned about American democracy through the very process of evacuation. These believe that a new start in Japan, with nothing but their bare hands to help them, will be easier than an attempt to win a place in America after the war.

---

## Help Wanted

The Fellowship Literature Department is looking for an editorial assistant. The *perfect* person would be able to type, do proof-reading and editorial work on manuscripts, and would have some knowledge of lay-out. He (or she) should also not be expecting to go to CPS or prison in the very near future.

## Jottings

The first "area conference" for Forerunners was held December 27 and 28 in Pittsburgh. Speakers were Bayard Rustin, Perry Saito, John Swomley, and V. P. Thomas.

* * *

From the government CPS camp at Mancos comes the story of Corbett Bishop and his "readings." At each meal Corbett raps for attention, then reads some choice bits from "Jesus, Thoreau, or A. J. Muste." Campers applaud, staff members remain conspicuously silent. Recently Corbett read a flagrantly patriotic bit: campers booed, staff members applauded wildly. Said Corbett, when the noise had died down, "You'll be interested to know that the writer of that little item was Adolf Hitler!"

* * *

Prince Louis Philippe de Bourbon, Jr., is an assignee at Magnolia, Arkansas, CPS camp.

* * *

Harold Welty and Lester Mattison are still trying to get their photographic record of CPS started. They need films, cameras, photographers, pictures. Write Lester at 3330 N. Oliver Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

* * *

Powellsville (Md.) CPS men have raised $35 so far to help conscientious objectors in prison.

* * *

James T. McDaniel, former field secretary for the FOR in Ohio and Pennsylvania, was sentenced November 22 at Dayton, Ohio, to four years for refusal to report for induction into the army.

* * *

Mexican soldiers in uniform have been forbidden to attend church services. "The rites of religious creeds do not conform with the dignity of the military uniform and insignia, nor with the martial personality of military men," read the order, which was signed by Mexico's president.

* * *

The motto of the Tenth Armored Division (USA) is "Terrify and Destroy."

* * *

A bill now before Congress would permit chaplains to rise to higher ranks. The limit now, for Chief of Chaplains, is Brigadier General. "Like a mighty army moves the church of God!"

* * *

A new Fellowship group has been organized in Argentina, and another group holds regular meetings in Nome, Alaska. That's pretty good coverage for this hemisphere, anyway.

* * *

Forerunners materials, including studybooks, are being translated into Spanish down in Mexico for the use of high-school age young people in that country.

# *Footnote on Cairo-Teheran*

Almost with each passing day it becomes clearer that the post-war "brave new world" is being constructed of the same explosive materials that were used to hold the precarious "world between wars" together: power politics and imperialism.

The ink on the famous Moscow statement was hardly dry before even its inadequate promises were being further compromised and weakened. On the very day that Secretary of State Hull gave his optimistic report of the conference, the Soviet newspaper *Izvestia* reported several "conditions" that had been put forward by Russia's delegation without objection from either Mr. Hull or Mr. Eden. And on November 16 Mr. Hull himself admitted in a press interview that several "prior agreements" had to be accepted before the Moscow discussions could even start.

These agreements, which the *Christian Century* speaks of as threatening the coming peace "as directly and devastatingly as ever the secret treaties of 1916 threatened the integrity of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points," include these provisions:

1. Russia will not tolerate any federation of small nations in Europe, and especially in the Balkans.

2. All questions of distribution of territory and fixing of boundaries must be left to the victor powers when the fighting ends. Matters concerning the self-determination of peoples, including plebiscites, etc., are not to be taken up until after the victor powers have finished redrawing the map.

Quickly on top of these revelations, which leave the promised "general international organization" looking pretty sick, came the conferences at Cairo and Teheran. They should have completed the disillusionment for millions.

Actually, little was said in specific terms at either conference. It was what was left unsaid that is most ominous.

At Cairo, Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-Shek discussed the war against Japan. The dominant note in their conference apparently was the agreement to strip Japan of all her possessions gained "by force and trickery," and crowd the Japanese back into the medieval isolationism that was broken down by American warships seventy years ago. Two points are important here:

*a.* This policy looks forward to the same treatment of a defeated enemy as was forced on Germany in 1919, and which sowed the seeds of the present war. The results of such a program would be to crowd the Japanese back into an admittedly inadequate homeland, and would leave a shrewd, ingenious people seething with resentment and hatred that would seek military "vindication" at the first opportunity. The immediate result, of course, will be the prolongation of the war, since it will unite the Japanese solidly behind their government in fear of so disastrous a defeat.

*b.* Since all emphasis was placed on *Japanese* imperialism, the unavoidable inference is that Mr. Churchill and Britain have not swerved an iota from their already stated position, that they intend to take back all their Asiatic colonies after the war. Aside from the obvious mockery this makes of our professed war aims, such a situation will mean increased loyalty of Burmese, Malayans, and other Asians to Japan, from whom they have gotten at least a degree of independence. That means that American boys, fighting in uncounted bloody battles in the Pacific, actually will be helping to bring unwilling peoples back under a hated foreign yoke!

The Teheran conference actually said even less than did Cairo. Messrs. Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin drank many toasts to one another, reaffirmed their intention to force unconditional surrender on Germany, and almost as a casual afterthought expressed certainty that they would be able to ensure peace after the war.

Again there was no statement of positive peace aims that might win an echo among Germany's war-weary people. Nor was there any disclaimer of Russia's intention to demand millions of German workers to labor "for years" at reconstruction in Russia, nor of the widely discussed suggestion that Germany be broken up into a loose federation of German states, nor of Stalin's insistence upon retaining the Baltic states and Bessarabia.

In other words, our statesmen are making the same mistakes that were made after World War I, but "making them bigger."

And the mistakes will be paid for by the millions of young lives likely to be poured out in a mass assault on "Fortress Europe," which almost certainly was the real subject of the Teheran talks. The weight of guilt for the awful butchery the heralded invasion portends will lie heavily on the Teheran conferees if they fail even to attempt a creative peace assault first. It will lie on us also if we do not strain every effort to recall our countrymen from this dance of death before it is too late.

R. A. H.


**FOR Field Secretaries**

*South:* Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Roger Axford, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Jean G. McKay, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles 27, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 440 East 13th Avenue, Denver 3, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Prairie du Sac, Wis.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

## Letter from Prison

*An excerpt from a letter sent by a conscientious objector in Federal prison to his wife.*

"Meeting today. And somehow I was deeply moved, though not by anything said, for there wasn't much said aloud. It is one of those tenderized feelings, sort of remorse, compassion, and deep inward joy comingled. H.... W.... said that the young Friends of ..... were anxious to do something for us here. We suggested books, and some 'influence' for parole was talked of from several angles.

"Afterwards several of us got to talking about parole and CPS, how this ought to be, etc., for COs. I felt uncomfortable during all of it but didn't know why. . . . Now here in the quiet . . . the feeling rushes in on me . . . . I am sure so much of my thoughts have been selfish. . . . And now a group wants to do something and we react selfishly—books for us, parole for us. There is so much that *needs* to be done, why do we worry about COs? What about the men I got to know in the county jails? . . . . the millions starving? . . . the Japanese in the west? . . . And then we suggest that they work for us! . . . How much more refining my soul needs!"

---

## COs in Prison—concl'd.

(*Continued from Page* 10)

1. It should be resorted to only when there has been adequate preparation on the part of the individuals involved and the movement of which they are a part.

2. There must be a severe crisis because the situation involved is deteriorating drastically.

3. All other avenues for advancing the cause must be closed. So far as possible, the conclusion that other avenues are closed should be arrived at on the basis of thorough experimentation with them.

4. The fast unto death may be unavoidable in a situation in which others than the fasters are being subjected to severe, unusual, and inexcusable suffering—other people who are somehow close to the fasters and for whose welfare they have a fairly direct and obvious responsibility. Presumably Evan Thomas was confronted with such a situation when during the last war other COs imprisoned with him in Leavenworth were being tortured.

5. The issue must be of such magnitude and urgency that the price being paid for its solution commends itself at least to a considerable number as proportionate to the objective sought.

6. Or, contrariwise, a fast unto death may seem unavoidable to a sensitive spirit in a situation where a monstrous evil is being perpetrated, against which witness must be borne in such a manner as to arrest attention, even though there is no expectation of achieving any immediate objective—where the action partakes of the "foolishness of the cross," so that it is only in some comparatively remote time that tangible fruit can be borne.

7. Care must be taken that this form of witness and action does not become a mere contest of wills—as between COs and prison officials, for example—for this implies a war psychology, the desire to break the will of the enemy. Certainly pacifists have no desire to coerce anyone to act in violation of his conscience any more than they want to be coerced to act in violation of conscience.

### "All Possible Support"

While this memo has placed much stress upon considerations which I believe actual or prospective "non-cooperators" should have in mind, we must recognize also that such men as these in the past often have proven to be true pioneers, and that men of other dispositions who follow other paths also are subject to peculiar temptations against which they need to guard.

Certainly those who follow a policy of "cooperation" with the persons involved in a situation need to be on guard lest in effect this means submission to a tolerance of or cooperation with the evil in the situation. A policy of "cooperation" is valid only if it grows out of a thorough-going disassociation from that evil. I am convinced also that it is dangerous to regard one technique among several as necessarily the highest expression of the spirit of love, "the Way of the Cross." That spirit may be equally present in men who follow diverse courses, as COs in prison have themselves freely recognized.

The "non-cooperators" already have brought certain serious abuses to public attention—even to the attention of prison officials, who were not previously aware of the existence of these abuses. Notable improvements are being made with regard to censorship of mail and admission of books and other reading matter in Federal prisons. As the National Council stated at its annual meeting, we have confidence in the honesty and integrity of our COs in prison. We are clear that we must continue to follow the policy that we feel has stood the test of experience, that is, of giving all possible support to individuals and groups in acting according to conscience.

At the same time pacifists certainly should not lose sight of the method of "the second mile" set forth and practiced by Jesus himself—the method of "strategic cooperation," to use a Gandhian phrase. Pacifists, as well as others, need Lin Yutang's warning: "Rectilinear absolutes must be worn off and made to disappear; action must be judged in waves and ripples and emerging and submerging cycles, and to do this, a longer range must be taken.... Nature always bends. Believers in power and direct action who think that they are 'thinking straight' are poor students of Nature. Therefore, following nature, according to Laotse:

To yield is to be preserved whole,
To be bent is to become straight,
To be hollow is to be filled,
To be tattered is to be renewed.

. . .

Stretch (a bow) to the very full,
And you will wish you had stopped in time,
Temper (a sword-edge) to its very sharpest,
And the edge will not last long."

Finally, the *Fellowship* has had in its Statement of Purpose from the first the paragraph: "They (FOR members) advocate such ways of dealing with offenders against society as shall transform the wrongdoers rather than inflict retributive punishment." Thus we have recognized that "prison reform" was one of the fields in which we should be most active, and that "offenders against society" should have our special concern. We cannot claim to have done much to meet this challenge. Our chief consideration now should be fixed not upon the pros and cons of the various attitudes taken by our COs in prison, but upon *how we may act most effectively to right those wrongs to which all of them are calling our attention.*

The existence of Jim Crow in prison, of censorship, of brutal treatment that still occurs, and so on, are real and grave issues of which we do not wish to lose sight. It is well, therefore, that at its December meeting the National Council provided for the appointment of a Prison Committee which will provide the membership with information and suggestions relative to problems both of COs and others in Federal, state, and local prisons.

---

## FOR — NSBRO

*(Continued from Page 11)*

The resolution expressed gratitude for the "thoughtful discussion" of the subject that has gone on in conferences, local meetings, CPS camps and prisons, and for the spirit in which the discussion has been conducted. It voiced the hope that "our decision may be a right one in the eyes of God and that though there may be a sharp divergence of viewpoint and conviction . . . . the strong bond of our Fellowship may in no way be broken by it."

It concluded with a call to Fellowship members to give themselves unitedly and vigorously to the many other responsibilities confronting them: "our work to bring the ghastly slaughter of war to an end, to curb the growing spirit of revenge and domination, to develop peace-mindedness among high-school age youth, to abolish Jim Crow, and to do our duty with some degree of adequacy in the great and delicate tasks of reconstruction and reconciliation that must be attempted when the war comes to an end."

# The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

## Education and the State

*Education Between Two Worlds,* by Alexander Mieklejohn. Harper and Bro. 1942. 312 pp. $3.00.

As human experience has broadened through the centuries the problem has constantly recurred to the seeker for Truth: how understand the great sweep of issues, how orient the mass of "facts" and information, how find the *thalweg* —the central stream of that experience? Now and again an observer, dipping into the midst of the stream, will try to reveal its basic content. Jesus discovered (1) brotherhood, (2) love, (3) the supremacy of reason over force, and (4) the rebirth of the individual in surrender to higher service, as the essential characteristics of the stream. A segment of mankind, basing its program on this understanding of the stream, has attempted to embody those principles in its living. But when from all sides we hear the present period spoken of as "revolution"; when we sense vaguely the disappearance of familiar landmarks; when authoritarian religion has been questioned and even denied; when the "isms" which attempt to interpret or change the direction of the current have increased to legion, we may well pause to examine an attempt of a modern serious thinker to redefine or discover the current.

Alexander Mieklejohn in *Education Between Two Worlds* finds the essential stream unaltered: (1) "the basic belief of our culture . . . is that all men are brothers" (p. 203); (2) "throughout its career, that culture has drawn a contrast between 'the appeal to reason' and the 'resort to violence' . . . Violence we have said, is savagery. Civilization is reasonableness." (p. 225); (3) "Socrates summed up his wisdom in the phrase, 'Be intelligent; act critically.' And Jesus . . . . said to his fellows, 'Be kind.' And in terms of sheer domination over the mind . . . . . no other pair of intellectual achievements can equal these two . . . . . Jesus and Socrates, out of very different backgrounds, are saying the same thing. Intelligence is kindness. Kindness is intelligence." (pp. 234-5) (4) " 'Whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it' was the old doctrine. It is now replaced by the assertion that each of us in a well-organized society, yields to the state [the people in action] all that he is, all that he has, and that, in doing so, each of us becomes a free person." (p. 215, 223).

Mieklejohn sets out to explore the shift in control of education from the church to the state and to answer the question of whether the state can teach or whether the shift has been a blunder. He begins with Comenius, a believer who says, 'I am a Christian; *therefore* . . . . . ' and goes on to John Locke a believer who says, 'I am a Christian; *but* . . ." (p. 26) Mieklejohn reveals with brutal starkness the dualistic theory of Locke, "the realm of conscience, in which men are subject to the laws of God, and the realm of prudence, in which men are subject to the laws of the state" (p. 65)—"the ideal theology for Anglo-Saxon 'practical common sense.' From this survey Mieklejohn concludes that neither could occupy the whole field of education, and a dicotomy grew up: the church to teach piety, the state to instruct in "prudence" necessary to guard a person's "interests."

In the person of Jean Jacques Rousseau is found a teacher who, abhoring this duplicity, finds a unifying quality, not in the God of Comenius, but in the "general will." Rousseau "takes the full stride into modern thought. Both men and the state are made by men. Civilization . . . . . is a human achievement." (p. 79) The author's credo is expressed in these words: "Teaching must find its roots in some active code of behavior. It must express some authoritative pattern of culture. It must believe something. Some social group must be speaking through it, impressing its way of life. Nothing short of that is education." (p. 103 ". . . . . in a liberal social order both customs and intelligence hold sway. It has a 'way of life' which is authoritative. But it also has activities of criticism by which that way is tested. Neither of these can replace the other. It is by a combination of the two that liberalism is created and sustained." (p. 113)

Both under the philosophy of Locke and under the pragmatists, for whom Mieklejohn accepts Dewey as a spokesman, private and public activities are sharply separated and the latter made subordinate to the former.

Completely unsatisfied with the theories of Dewey and Arnold and Locke—the Christian-capitalist dualism—Mieklejohn seeks a way out: "If we can no longer believe in God can we maintain, can we carry on, the civilization which was founded on that belief?" (p. 200) He then performs a tautalogical legerdemain, startling at least to those of us who found religious belief as much on "that of God in man" or the "inner light" as on "revelation." For he rules out religion but accepts the product of what many of us conceive to be a religious process: "human prophets have perceived in human nature itself the beauty of holiness, the strength of humility, the magnificence of wisdom" and "in the form of religious belief . . . have thrown upon a cosmic screen their most profound convictions, their deepest insights about themselves." (pp. 202-203) Under new terminology it is for Mieklejohn's "we moderns" to attempt to create "a non-theological civilization which can carry on the work of morality and intelligence" (p. 85) by "the substitution of the state for the church as the primary institution of human brotherhood." (p. 210) But the thread of the stream remains the same—universal brotherhood, love, the supremacy of reason over force, the rebirth of the individual in service to the whole.

The pregnant consideration for those who seek to chart the stream is not that Mr. Mieklejohn has insisted on using new symbols, it is that his experiments have verified the direction and course. Important to the pacifist is the recognition by the author of those factors which we believe must eventuate in the acceptance of the way of non-violence: "The question of the relation between the 'appeal to reason' and the 'resort to violence' is . . . . the most crucial political issue facing our contemporary culture." (p. 227) "Human peace and understanding, human reasonableness and government, cannot be made out of bargains. They must be made only by agreements." (p. 229) "Victory at arms decides no moral questions. It provides no principles of judgment and, especially, it is impossible to establish political authority on a basis of military conquest. Right cannot be based on force. When one nation conquers another it is nonsense to talk of 'a just peace.' So far as the war goes, the relation between the victor and vanquished is that between any animal and its prey. When victory is won, one nation has been shown to be stronger than another, and nothing else has been shown. War as such cannot be civilized. Civilization is created only as war is abolished." (p. 240-241)

Dr. Mieklejohn concludes "that the whole world of human behavior can be dealt with as a single enterprise which a single cooperative human intelligence is trying to direct" (p. 283), therefore "fundamentally education belongs to the world-state" in order that a reasonable world may be founded and world reasonableness taught.

But having said all this in appreciation of the conclusions in the book, what then? In its sheer breathtaking totalitarian implications the book has few equals. If all education must be the expression of some group, will either the best "education" or the best "state" be derived from centralized control? Do we not need "religious" and "liberal" and "conservative" group expressions through education in order that the general group, the state, may come nearest to selection of truth? Particularly in a world where individuals crave freedom from violence, yet the state conceives of itself in terms of organized force do we not need the religious education of non-violence? To those of us who have been in college teaching and watched the military state take over and observed its results, some of Mr. Mieklejohn's observances lack conviction. Does not Mieklejohn assume a state "converted," and how shall a state be converted save by religion?

HARROP A. FREEMAN

# The Forlorn Tale of Three Busy People, Several Unkept Dates, and a Lot of Very Nice Customers

This is the story of a Pretty Secretary, a C.O. Waiting for Assignment to CPS, and a Man with Lines in His Face. Their names are Ruth, Vlad, and Al, in that order, and they are the people usually referred to on this page as the Literature Department. Among them they Prepare Manuscripts of Books and Pamphlets for the Printer, Read Proof and Make Layouts, Write Letters and Ads to Tell People about the Books and Pamphlets, Keep a Record of the Orders that Come In, Fill the Orders, and Wrap and Mail the Packages of Books and Pamphlets. Between times, they also work on a small paper called *The Forerunner* and a big magazine called *Fellowship.*

It is the story also of some Unkept Dates. They are the Dates on which the Man with Lines in His Face promised (in those letters and ads) to have certain of these books and pamphlets ready to ship out.

And right at this point, to illustrate why those Dates were Unkept, you are asked to read two Case Histories.

## CASE HISTORY—BOOK A

Begun early in 1943. All ready to go to printer, when word came of restrictions on use of paper. (This was an accidental discovery—the government never bothered to notify us.) Asked gov't. for additional allotment of paper. Three months later gov't. said O.K. On promise of printer, Lit. Dep't. advertised: *"Fall of Christianity*—Ready Oct. 15." Printer then lost six pressmen to draft—presses stood idle; so did *Fall.* Lit. Dep't. advertised: "Ready Nov. 15." Then bindery couldn't get cloth; *Fall* stood still again. Lit. Dep't. said: "Ready Dec. 10." Bindery found die-stamp too big: had to make new one. First copy, *Fall of Christianity,* arrived in Lit. Dep't. Dec. 19. Everyone working overtime to fill piled-up orders.

## CASE HISTORY—PAMPHLET B

Vernon Nash sent in manuscript of *Exit Empire,* new studybook, July 21. To be ready September 1. Presses tied up with 2nd edition *Pattern for Peacemakers* and *New Wars for Old.* October: Lit. Dep't. promises: "Ready soon." Second editions *PFP* and *NWFO,* sell out in six weeks; *Exit Empire* held up for third editions. November: Lit. Dep't. says, "Ready this month." Printer loses 6 pressmen (see Case History A). Studybooks moved to new printer. *PFP* and *NWFO* finished. Lit. Dep't. says: *"Exit Empire* ready *about* Dec. 15." Dec. 18 —*Exit Empire* on press; should be here in ten days. Lit. Dep't. promises nothing.

## And So—

The Man with Lines in His Face gets More Lines, and the Pretty Secretary lies awake worrying about the Unfilled Orders and the Explanations and Apologies she must write, and the C.O. wishes they'd hurry and send him to CPS. But the Customers, who are really Very Nice Customers indeed, never get exasperated or impatient, but only occasionally write in to inquire very gently about a month-old order. Which is the reason why the Pretty Secretary and the C.O., and the Man with Lines are all so extremely fond of their Customers, who are also their fellow FOR members, and wish to tell them how sorry they are for the delays, and to promise to try to do better in the New Year.

*P.S.*—You'll be glad to know, though, that the Literature Department has been selling those pacifist books and pamphlets all year, at a rate of $1,000 a month, which compares with about $400 a month in the last year before the U. S. entered the war. Literature given away, or sold below cost, amounted to more than $5,000 additional in 1943.

*P.S. No.* 2—We have so many books and pamphlets on sale now that we can't possibly advertise them all in *Fellowship.* But our new literature list and order blank will be ready (?) about January 20. Please write in for one.

Sincerely yours,

THE PRETTY SECRETARY
THE C.O. WAITING ASSIGNMENT TO CPS
THE MAN WITH LINES IN HIS FACE